



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/013,097	12/06/2001	Oliver Morgan	A00023(2)	9563

26643 7590 05/17/2004

PETER J. GORDON, PATENT COUNSEL
AVID TECHNOLOGY, INC.
ONE PARK WEST
TEWKSBURY, MA 01876

EXAMINER

LIANG, GWEN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2172

DATE MAILED: 05/17/2004

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

OK

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/013,097

Applicant(s)

MORGAN ET AL.

Examiner

GWEN LIANG

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 December 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

A comma needs to be inserted between "files" and "a mismatch" on page 4 line 15 to enhance the readability.

Appropriate correction is required to be made to the aforementioned and any other informalities existing in the disclosure.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, "an evolved property definition" as in claim 1, "a synthesized property definition" as in claim 4 and all the associated means, must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are

required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 212 on page 6, 318 on page 8. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1-3, 4-6, 7-9, 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In independent claims 1 and 7, it is not clear to the examiner what subject matter the clause "that is different from a corresponding property" is referring to. Is it "the first implementation" or "each property"?

In independent claims 4 and 10, it is not clear to the examiner what subject matter the clause "that lacks a corresponding property definition" is referring to. Is it "the first implementation" or "each property"?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nguyen et al., "Nguyen" (U.S. Patent No. 6,119,130).

With respect to claim 1, Nguyen discloses a system ...comprising:

means for specifying an evolved property definition in the first implementation to refer to a corresponding property definition in the second implementation, for each property in the first implementation that is different from a corresponding property in the second implementation (See for example: col. 2 lines 56-58, "A mechanism is also provided for converting the data from the stored format to the expected format when the two formats do not match."); and

means for redirecting accesses using the evolved property definition to access the corresponding property definition in the second implementation (See for example: col. 2 lines 38-43, wherein the means for redirecting accesses is inherent since the

motivation of Nguyen is to provide a method and apparatus that allows software to access data even when the format of the data is based on a different schema version than the schema version supported and expected by the software; col. 2 line 46-48, "A method and apparatus that allow schema evolution to occur without requiring applications that expect older schemas to be recompiled is provided.", wherein means for redirecting accesses is also inherent; col. 53-58, wherein the evolved property definition being used to redirect access is inherent because the mechanism provided for converting the data from the stored format to the expected format corresponds to the claimed "evolved property definition", as defined in the applicant's specification page 7 lines 8-9.)

Claim 2 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 1 and furthermore Nguyen discloses a system wherein the means for specifying comprises:
means for executing stored instructions for deriving one schema from another
(See for example: col. 2 lines 53-58; Fig. 1b "DATA FORMAT CONVERSION UNIT").

Claim 3 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 1 and furthermore Nguyen discloses a system wherein the means for specifying comprises:
means for accessing stored information describing two schemas (See for example: col. 4 lines 61-66); and
means for determining a difference between the two schemas (See for example: col. 10 lines 30-33).

With respect to claim 4, Nguyen discloses a system ...comprising:

means for specifying a synthesized property definition in the first implementation for each property in the first implementation that lacks a corresponding property definition in the second implementation; and means for maintaining information about accesses to the synthesized property definition (See for example: col. 10 lines 46-51, "For attributes that are present in the stored format that do not exist in the target format, no data is placed in the target instance. For attributes that are not present in the stored format but are present in the target format, user-defined default values or NULL values are stored in the target instance of the object. For example, a NULL string may be placed in the target instance for a string attribute that exists in the target format but not in the stored format.")

Claim 5 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 4 and furthermore Nguyen discloses a system wherein the means for specifying comprises:

means for executing stored instructions for deriving one schema from another (See for example: col. 2 lines 53-58; Fig. 1b "DATA FORMAT CONVERSION UNIT").

Claim 6 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 4 and furthermore Nguyen discloses a system wherein the means for specifying comprises:

means for accessing stored information describing two schemas (See for example: col. 4 lines 61-66); and

means for determining a difference between the two schemas (See for example: col. 10 lines 30-33).

Claims 7-9 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 1-3.

Claims 10-12 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 4-6.

With respect to claim 13, Nguyen discloses a system ...comprising:

means for detecting a mismatch between a stored object of a class from the first implementation and the metadata schema of the second implementation describing objects of the class (See for example: col. 53-58, "To supply the data in the expected format, mechanisms are provided for determining the format expected by the application and the format in which the data is currently stored. A mechanism is also provided for converting the data from the stored format to the expected format when the two formats do not match."; and

means for notifying the second implementation of any detected mismatch (See for example: Fig. 5 steps 500, 507).

Claim 14 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 13 and furthermore Nguyen discloses a system comprising:

means for correcting the mismatch (See for example: col. 2 lines 56-58).

Claims 15, 16 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 13, 14.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Burns, "NDS gets Microsoft's ear": A directory synchronization product, capable of mapping attributes across two directory services.

Bowden, "Microsoft® Windows® 2000 and Microsoft® Exchange 2000 Server Deploying the Active Directory Connector", "Schema discovery" section: An application that allows the Active Directory Connector (ADC) to work out the restrictions imposed by the target directory and perform the necessary conversion when replicating between two different systems, wherein the format and restrictions for the data may be different for each system.


Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GWEN LIANG whose telephone number is 703-305-3985. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 A.M. - 5:30 P.M. Monday and Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JOHN BREENE can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

G.L.
30 April 2004


JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER